

**REMARKS**

Claims 2-26 are pending. By this Amendment, the title, specification and claims 2-9 and 24 are amended and claim 1 is canceled. Support for the amendments to the specification and claims can be found in Applicants' Fig. 6, for example.

The title was objected to and Applicants' amended the title responsive to the objection. It is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

The specification was objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.71. By this Amendment, the specification, on page 18, lines 10-15, and page 24, lines 17-21, has been amended to clearly define the width in view of Fig. 6. Accordingly, the width has been clearly defined in the specification. It is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. By this Amendment, claims 3, 6 and 7 have been amended consistent with the specification. It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 1-26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over Smith et al. (hereinafter "Smith"), U.S. Patent No. 6,473,279. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Smith fails to disclose an electromagnetic transducer laminate where a width in a longitudinal direction of a semi-hard magnetic layer is larger than a width in a longitudinal direction of a first ferromagnetic layer, as recited in claims 3 and 8 and as similarly recited in claim 7.

Smith discloses an MR sensor 300 with a ferromagnetic reference layer 306 and a ferromagnetic free layer 310, as well as other layers. As shown in Figs. 3A and 3B, the width in a longitudinal direction of the ferromagnetic reference layer 306 is the same as the width in a longitudinal direction of the ferromagnetic free layer 310. Smith fails to provide any disclosure with regard to a width in a longitudinal direction of one layer being larger than a width in a longitudinal direction of another layer. Smith also fails to identify the advantages associated


with the different widths as discussed on page 24, line 17 - page 25, line 3 of Applicants' specification.

It is respectfully requested that the rejection be withdrawn.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Scott M. Schulte  
Registration No. 44,325

JAO:SMS/sxb

Date: December 29, 2005

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 19928**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
--